UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,316	06/21/2005	Rudi J.M Wijnands	US 030001	1302
24737 7590 09/10/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			BAIG, SAHAR A	
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/540,316	WIJNANDS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SAHAR A. BAIG	2623
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 and 22 and 23 and 24 an	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2005 is/are: 10 2005 2005 2005 2006 20	awn from consideration. for election requirement. ner.	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correctally. The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/21/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316 Page 2

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 06/21/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, and 19, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650.

Regarding Claim 1, 2, 10, 17, 18, and 19, Berstis discloses a personal recording and playback system comprising: a receiving means for receiving streaming audio/visual input from at least one of: broadcast radio, broadcast TV stations, cable TV systems, satellite TV systems, the Internet, and other wide-area networks [Figure 4B item 412]; a means for connecting to wide area networks including the Internet and receiving streaming audio or audio/visual input [Figure 1]; a user input means for inputting user commands to the recording/playback

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316

Art Unit: 2623

system [Figure 1 item 218]; and, a recording means for transparently: tracking audio or audio/visual preferences of a user of the system [Col. 2 lines 5-10]; maintaining a user profile database for storing and maintaining user preferences (since the stream is monitored for user-defined items it is obvious that the system stores those user-defined items or user profile in memory); receiving multiple audio or audio/visual streams via the receiving means and storing the received multiple audio or audio/visual streams on the storage means in the background; and, maintaining an audio or audio/visual recording collection according to the user preferences by analyzing the received audio/visual streams [Col. 5 lines 60-65].

Page 3

However Bersitis fails to explicitly mention a storage mean for storing the received streaming audio or audio/visual input and a user output means for outputting the audio or audio/visual input. Bersitis also fails to disclose the use of virtual channels. In an analogous art, De Vos discloses a recording system. In particular De Vos disclose the storage means [Col.1 lines 34-35]; and the user output means [Col. 1 lines 40-42]. De Vos also shows the use of virtual channels [Figure 11]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of De Vos and Bersitis to devise a recording system with sufficient memory for storing the user preferred media content.

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding Claim 4 and 11, Bersitis discloses a system further including: a selection means for playing audio or audio/visual streams selected by the user via the input device on the user output device from one of: the receiving means; and, the audio/visual collection [Figure 2 The user may selectively control operation of data processing system 200 through input entered on keyboard 220 or through pointing device 222].

Page 4

4. Claim 3 and 20, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650 in further view of Volk et al. US Patent Publication No. 2004/0019497.

Regarding Claim 3 and 20, the combined system of Berstis and De Vos disclose all of the limitations except a most-popular list means for storing the most often broadcasted audio/visual streams, and, the recording means that further: updates the most-popular list with the most often broadcasted audio or audio/visual streams. In an analogous art, Volk discloses a system and method for providing personalized music playback over a network. In particular Volk discloses a method of providing a plurality of hypertext links 434 to stations that are most requested, listened to, or connected to by the various users. That list of hypertext links 434 may be periodically updated and may reflect the users' listening preferences over a predetermined time period [0065]. Therefore it would

have been obvious to include the teachings of Volk in the present invention to provide quick access to most popular media content.

5. Claim 5, 12, and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650 in further view of Wang et al. US Patent Publication No. 2002/0083060.

Regarding Claim 5, 12, and 21, the combined teachings of De Vos and Berstis disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except the use of fingerprint analysis for identifying audio or audio/visual streams by matching a portion or portions of the stream to fingerprints stored in one of a local fingerprint database and a remote fingerprint database. In an analogous art, Wang teaches of a method for recognizing an audio sample locates an audio file that most closely matches the audio sample from a database indexing a large set of original recordings. In particular Wang shows In **FIG. 10A**, a diagonal line of slope approximately equal to one is identified, indicating that the song indeed matches the sample **[0086]**.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of audio fingerprinting analysis to match the songs that are most listened to by the user with the ones that are being broadcasted. 6. Claim 6 and 13, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650 in further view of Dimitrova et al. US Patent No. 6,100,941.

Page 6

Regarding Claim 6 and 13, the combined teachings of Berstis and De Vos disclose all of the claimed limitations except a content analysis means for examining an audio or audio/visual stream and identifying commercial detection. In an analogous art, Dimitrova discloses a method locating a commercial disposed within a video data stream **Figure 5**. Therefore it would have been obvious to include the method of commercial detection to analyze the incoming audio/video stream for commercials.

7. Claim 7 and 14, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650 in further view of Porter et al. US Patent No. 6,337,947.

Regarding Claim 7 and 14, the combined teachings of Berstis and De Vos disclose all of the claimed limitations except a video removal means for removing a video portion from an audio/visual stream, leaving an audio portion. In an analogous art, Porter discloses a method for customized editing and/or censoring of video and/or audio signals. In particular Porter discloses that each of the editing parameters corresponds to separate portions of the signal (audio and

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316

Art Unit: 2623

video) When an editing parameter indicates that the corresponding portion of the signal is to be edited, the selective editing circuit edits the corresponding portion based on the editing parameter, which may be provided by the content provider or by the user. In addition, the editing parameter may indicate various levels of editing the signal. For example, the editing parameter may indicate that the portion of the audio and/or video signal is to be completely blanked, skipped, faded, distorted, or is to be replaced with a substitute audio and/or video signal [Col.2 lines 20-35]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include this feature in the instant invention so that video portions of a

Page 7

8. Claim 8, 9, 15, and 16, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al US Patent No. 6,212,327 in view of De Vos et al US Patent No. 6,128,650 in further view of Son et al. US Patent No. 2002/0047899.

media content can be selectively removed leaving behind the aural portions.

Regarding Claim 8, 9, 15, and 16, the combined system of Bersitis and De Vos teach all of the claimed limitations except format-check means for determining and decoding a format of an audio or audio/visual stream, the formats including: MPEG2; MPEG4; MP3; Ogg Vorbis; DIVX; Realplayer Real-Video; Realplayer Real-Audio; Microsoft Windows Media; Microsoft Netshow; Apple Quicktime; Xing StreamWorks; and analog. These formats are industry standards and their decoding is well known in the art. Furthermore it is taught in Son along with the

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316 Page 8

Art Unit: 2623

use of Plug-ins **[0022]**. Therefore these features would have been obvious to include in the invention for the benefit of decoding multiple types of data.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. It includes Callahan et al. US Patent No. 6,792,469 and Seo et al. US Patent Publication No. 2004/0105661.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAHAR A. BAIG whose telephone number is (571)270-3005. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/5/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/540,316 Page 9

Art Unit: 2623

/Chris Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623

SB